3GPP TSG-T2 #16
Sophia Antipolis, France
11-15 February 2002

T2-020116

Title:	**LS on response to S5-020027 (T2-020240) UEM Feasibility Study (TR 32.802)**
Source:	**T2**
To:	**SA5**
Cc:	

Contact Person:
    Name: Peter Neumann, Siemens
    E-mail Address: peter.neumann@mch.siemens.de

Attachments:
    Annex - UEM Technical Feasibility Comments

---

1. General

This LS is the response on the latest version of UEM Feasibility Study in TR 32.802 v1.0.2 provided for consideration in the document S5-020027. With interest and also raising concerns we have reviewed the changes made after the last meeting in Cancun, Mexico.

2. Details

First of all we are concerned about the slight but dramatic change of the target release from "post REL-5" into REL-6. The whole size of the task expected to be finished in Rel-6 is a huge task for a very short and now limited time frame. In addition some delegates have already identified a few holes and gaps in the draft report so that there is the feeling that the report is far away from being complete or ready to be approved in the light of REL-6 and certainly needs more time for discussion. Even if the tasks can with a narrowed version be completed in REL-6 we see currently no possibility to also be able to provide and finish the corresponding stage 2 and stage 3 descriptions in the same time frame.

3. Examples

Currently the feasibility study completely misses the potential high risks in changing/ updating/ replacing the terminal software. Before we can provide means to do any kind of modification of the terminal software we need to create the concept of a recovery process in case the modification leads to an unstable and/or faulty mobile status. On the other hand the existing report include currently only the simple case where a mobile resides in a single network where a subscriber is using a single USIM. But in reality this is only a very simplified view where the normal complexity like multiple different terminals being used in different environments (i.e. national and international as well as plastic roaming into different networks) is missed out completely and not mentioned/described at all. We think that modifications being made while roaming are only valid as long as the user is staying in that network and must disappear after being back in their home network.

In addition it is a very network centric view and e.g. network faults detected by the terminal are not covered yet. Also the billing concept is missing in the feasibility report so the question is who pays for the wanted or even unwanted software terminal updates. There must be also a challenging concept to compensate the costs in case of terminal software crashes totally and a recovery mechanisms needs to be performed to limit the trouble to the user.

It has to be highlighted that we currently do not understand how the mapping of section 4 and section 6 of the report shall be done and how the terminal capabilities shall be mapped into the plan for release 6. According to

our reception and understanding the report sent for comments is a feasibility study from a service point of view rather than a feasibility study from the technical/implementation point of view.

Some more details are provided in an attached document, labelled "UEM Technical Feasibility Comments".

4. Conclusion

We at T2 believe that a phased approach has to be established where a staircase starting with simple requirements first is necessary and that the level of complexity can be increased later on.

We would like very much to support your work, and would like to propose that a Joint Meeting with T2-SWG2 would be beneficial. We would like to suggest that it could be co-located with the SA5 Meeting in Cork on April 2-5, 2002.

ACTIONS

To SA5

 SA5 – To re-consider the change from post-REL-5 to REL-6. To consider the above items for 32.802.

 SA5 – Confirm Joint Meeting by end of February 2002.

Date of Next T2 Meetings:

T2#17	13-17 May 2002	North America
T2#18	12-16 Aug 2002	Germany

ANNEX TO T2-020116: UE Management Technical Feasibility Comments

In **Section 6 of TS 32.802** on UE Management, SA5 has "identified UEM capabilities". T2 would like to give the following response to these requirements. The remarks are **based on the assumption of a generic UEM application** that is independent of UE model. T2 notes that in general the requirements affect not only the UE but also other parts of the system.

6.1) UE Configuration Query Capability and **6.2) UE Reconfiguration Capability**

T2 comments:

- A harmonised data description of the parameters is required and can be implemented using the Generic User Profile / Data Description Framework.

- A common transport protocol for data and commands is also needed and can be based on SyncML with additional capabilities to support the management.

- There are several security related requirements: Authentication of the operator (the requestor) as well as the UE, and integrity protection of the messages on both downlink and uplink.

The GUP work is planned for completion within Release 6, but from the present time scales it is today unclear if all of the needed work, such as transport mechanisms and security, based on the GUP concept, also can be completed within that time frame.

The SyncML is an available standard; however, for maximum efficiency of the solutions, T2 might request some amendments. The time scales for this is dependent on both the total GUP related work plan and up to the discretion of the SyncML Initiative.

Concerning the security mechanisms, the security part of MExE is being reviewed and an amended solution is expected for Release 6 that will allow easier support of these requirements.

6.3)   UE Software Update Capability

T2 comment: T2 has over the years discussed software download in particular in the MExE work. In respect to "non-application" (or "native") software, T2 provides framework mechanisms, but in terms of detailed (Stage 3) specifications, the matter is considered so complex (and costly) that it has been left out of scope of standardisation. There are today no plans to include this in the T2 work plan and any solution is left to proprietary mechanisms. This means that T2 presently *cannot offer any standardised solution to this requirement*.

6.4)   Remote UE Diagnostics Capability

T2 comment: A diagnostic application must be considered as native software; a generic such application would require an unrealistic degree of standardisation of the internal structure of the UE. This means that even if the issue of download had been solved, the operator would need to handle a number of proprietary applications. T2 suggests that SA5 *instead consider applications at their support centre* to analyse the responses received by the Configuration Query Capability for possible activation of the Reconfiguration Capability.

T2 concluding comment to Section 6:

- T2 cannot in Release 6 provide support for all of the requested functions.
- T2 asks SA5 to consider the above for a prioritisation of their requirements.

Based on such a prioritisation and the proper Stage 1 and Stage 2 on UEM (that T2 expects will be developed) T2 will be happy to continue the co-operation and elaborate further detailed mechanisms for UEM support.